

# Social Trends

PROHIBITION  
NUMBER

February

1 9 3 0



## ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON LAW

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his posterity swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particular the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. As the patriots of '76 rallied to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor—let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own and children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling-books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation; and let the young and old, the rich and poor, the grave and gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."



### "YOU CAN'T MAKE MEN SOBER BY LAW"

They tell us that we cannot be made sober by act of Parliament. I hate these little, smug, pettifogging, and inaccurate pieces of proverbial philosophy. They are thrown off by men who cannot think, and they are believed in by fools. I say that every experience that the world has had, and I do not care where you go for it—go north, go south, go east, go west; keep within your own empire or go outside; confine your attention to the Anglo-Saxon race or go outside it and take the Slavs—go anywhere experiments may have been made, and the conclusion is absolutely inevitable and irresistible, that you can make men and women sober by act of Parliament.—Premier Ramsay MacDonald.

# SOCIAL TRENDS

*A Digest of Useful Information on Current  
Social Events and Problems*

Alva W. Taylor, Editor

Caroline Duval Taylor, Associate

101 Bowling Ave.

Nashville, Tenn.

---

Volume III.

February, 1930

Number 2

---

## Why Prohibition—And When?

Prohibition won as a social reform. It will be defended as a social reform or it will be amended to suit the convictions of those Americans who base their Americanism upon the principles of personal liberty. Devotion to personal liberty is the most deeply laid of all American principles; it is a dogma with us; we defend it even when its use by one results in the loss of it to another. The average man flares up when his personal liberty is touched. Unless its impairment has been established in code or custom as a social necessity he will break the law when he believes it unjustly interferes with his God-given individual right. You may tell him with freedom what he ought to think and do—that is your personal right—but you cannot tell him what he must do until you establish the conviction in public opinion and the habits of social custom.

We seem to be a lawless people because of this. We do not, like the Englishman, reverence law because it is law; he has an unbroken tradition of obedience to authority coming down from the days when kings ruled by divine right; we broke the tradition when we broke with the king and in violence and revolution threw off both monarchy and authoritarianism, adopting the French ideal of individual sovereignty. The Britisher still allows himself to be called a subject, but has evolved a very successful balance between law and liberty; we have established the emancipating principle of personal liberty, but have not yet integrated it altogether into the demands of law and an orderly social living together. Thus many otherwise very good folk break some laws with impunity and without any scruples, and the lawless in temper break them all with an air of bravado.

## WHO IS LAWLESS— AND IN WHAT?

The principles of equity run through all law. When laws are made a matter of the letter they become instruments of tyranny. "The letter kills, the spirit gives life." The spirit of the law furnishes the basis of justice, and that leaves every individual some discretion in the interpretation of the question of his duty under the law. It is reverence for the law and a spirit of law-abidingness rather than a slavish conformity that makes liberty and law compatible. The rights of individual conscience may, in some grave circumstances, such as war or taxation, require civil disobedience, but such rights are justified by sacrifice, never by indulgence. There is no room for comparison between a Quaker conscience and a liquor appetite. The lawless man is the one who breaks the law to suit his own selfish convenience or for the sake of his own profit or to satisfy his own selfish appetite or desire.

Thus our lawlessness is not limited to those who break the old and established law against stealing, killing, etc.; it runs much more dangerously among the conventionally respectable who make their own rules when they drive an auto on the public highway, sell shoddy or adulterated goods for a profit, hire able legal minds to help them detour limitations imposed upon property privileges, lie to the tax assessor, patronize the bootlegger and, in general, evade the laws in both their letter and their spirit with an air of individual superiority. Right here is where the wets register; if the bootlegger's business were limited to the recognized criminal class we could control him at least as well as we control banditry, murder or petty thieving—it would be a case of the underworld and the police. But his best and most profitable customers are not criminals but a multitude of folk who are classed as average citizens, and his very best are among well-to-do or rich people, many of whom want prohibition for the workingman, the lowly and the negro. They defy the law for the sake of self-indulgence and make themselves partners of the criminal bootlegger.

### THE CONSCIENCE OF THE BOOTLEGGER'S PATRON

Practically everybody breaks the automobile road laws. Even ministers tell with a chuckle about having to go to the police court with a "tag." The infraction

of laws regarding goods is almost as widespread as business itself. The sanitary and fire laws are poorly obeyed and rarely is the one who fails to observe them given more than a warning. City ordinances regarding smoke are disobeyed with brazen impunity by both big and little business, as a glance over almost any American city proves. All such laws are rules of the common good and no one thinks of repealing them. "Getting by the law" is one of the favorite American sports. To a lot of folk the same spirit, exactly, rules in their attitude toward prohibition. Laws requiring vaccination are effective when either popular enlightenment leads to acceptance or police power is made effective, or the two are made to work together.

Laws regarding liquor will be made effective in about the same way. Where the majority of the citizenship in a local enforcement area is dry by conviction, prohibition works, providing the temperance folk put the right men in office. No law works without the right men in office, and no law works 100 per cent, not even those regarding murder and banditry, but the prohibition law is as effective as any other when the voters want it to be made so. But in certain large enforcement areas great numbers do not believe in prohibition. They are no more willing to obey this law than is the factory manager who breaks the anti-smoke law or the good citizen who makes his own law for the auto road, nor do they feel any more searing of the conscience about it. One or more of three things must take place. They must be personally convinced of the merit of the law, or they must be coerced by the police, or the demands of public opinion must be made so great that they will yield and bow to it as good citizens. It is doubtful if law enforcement can be made effective in large and overwhelming wet areas without this mandate from that three-fourths of the public who are dry. Either that or a return to local option and control.

#### SENATOR BORAH'S PHILIPPIC ON ENFORCEMENT

"I presume, of course, that the President wants clean and efficient service, and I say to those Senators that we have not got that at the present time.

"Washing your hands with sightless soap in the presence of the President will not bring effective service. It is necessary to state the facts and they are going to be stated.

"I assert that the permit system itself as it is being carried on is a scandal—that it is being used in such a way as to demoralize the whole enforcement system. And I assert that the law enforcement department is responsible for this.

"I further state that practically open saloons are running in the jurisdiction of district attorney after district attorney in this country.

"When I say this I do not mean simply New York or Chicago, I mean to state a condition which prevails throughout the country.

"I do not assume that you can catch every bootlegger. But the open, flaunting, defiant, persistent disregard of the law, day after day and month after month, with no effort being made to stop it, calls for discussion. That, in my judgment, is the best way to help the President and especially to help the enforcement of the law."

### HOW PROHIBITION HAS PAID

Prohibition has made good in just the measure that it has been enforced. Even in the wet areas the abolition of the saloon has been all to the good. It is better to have a slinking bootlegger that has to deal furtively than a licensed barkeeper dealing in the open. When a drinker has to get his liquor by devious ways he gets less of it. The result is improvement in public welfare. We said prohibition would reduce crime, insanity, pauperism, etc., and we said it would increase sobriety, savings, working efficiency, schooling, health, and all things that count for human betterment, and it has done all these things in just the measure that it has been made to prohibit.

#### *Drunkenness*

Under prohibition, drunkenness decreased 61 per cent in New York City (computation from the World Almanac, 1928).

Drunkenness commitments throughout the United States have declined under prohibition 55 per cent (United States Census, volume on "Prisoners," page 31, table 12).

Prior to prohibition there were nearly or quite 250 inebriate hospitals or "cures," supported by addicts seeking to escape the slavery of drink. Less than 10 per cent of these remain as liquor cures.

"First-time drunks," the record of which measures the number of recruits to the staggering army of inebriates, has fallen in New York City from 24 per

10,000 in 1914, wet, to 6 per 10,000 in 1925—a reduction of 75 per cent (Karl G. Carsten, from record of New York City Finger Print Bureau).

### *Labor*

Industrial wages, all industries, 1914, wet, \$4,000,000,000; 1925, dry, \$10,730,000,000 (United States Statistical Abstract, 1926, page 148).

Strikes and lockouts, 1916, wet, 2,579; 1926, 828—a decrease of more than two-thirds. Men involved, 1916, 1,600,000; 1925, 428,416—a decrease of nearly three-fourths (World Almanac, 1928, page 192).

Number of industrial workers, 1914, was 7,015,000; 1925, dry, 8,384,000 (United States Statistical Abstract, page 748).

Wage index, 1914, wet, 102; 1927, dry, 260, or more than double; “actual wage,” or purchasing power of the average wage, has increased by one-half (Dean Edward T. Devine, American University, in Current History, August, 1928).

Pounds of bread and butter purchasable at retail with one week's wage in America and other countries, computation made on wages of day labor, textile workers, coal miners, carpenters, electricians, and railway engineers:

United States, 561 pounds; United Kingdom (Britain), 240 pounds; Sweden, 206 pounds, Germany, 150 pounds; France, 127 pounds; Italy, 125 pounds; Japan, 99 pounds Belgium, 96 pounds (United States Department of Commerce).

Moreover, hours of labor per week are fewer in America than in any of the other nations.

### *Business*

During the first eight dry years population increased 8 per cent, but—

Dividends paid, 1913, wet, \$1,777,000,000; 1926, dry, \$4,335,000,000; gain, 144 per cent.

New capital stock, 1920, wet, \$4,000,000,000; 1926, dry, \$7,000,000,000; gain, 75 per cent.

Raw materials, 1914, wet, \$14,000,000,000; 1926, dry, \$35,000,000,000; gain, 150 per cent.

Value of products, 1914, wet, \$24,000,000,000; 1925, dry, \$67,000,000,000; gain, 189 per cent.

Added value, 1914, wet, \$19,000,000,000; 1925, dry, \$27,000,000,000; gain, 42 per cent.

Deposits in bank, 1916, wet, \$23,000,000,000; 1926, dry, \$49,000,000,000; gain, 53 per cent.

Freight car loadings, 1921, 756,215; 1926, 1,025,185; gain, 26 per cent (United States Statistical Abstract, 1926).

National earnings, 1921, \$62,000,000,000; 1928, \$90,000,000,000; gain, 45 per cent (National Bureau of Economic Research).

#### THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR SUMS UP FOR NEW YORK

A direct economic loss of \$6,561,973 due to alcoholic insanity, through the loss of earning power by the patients and the maintenance charges placed upon the State, occurred during 1928, a survey by the State Department of Mental Hygiene discloses. The full effect of the use of alcohol is still larger, however, as it was found to be a contributing factor in more than a dozen other forms of mental cases, among patients admitted to state institutions.

Cases of alcoholic insanity represented 5.9 per cent of all groups admitted to state institutions during the year. These, added to the cases in which alcohol is a contributing factor, produced a rating of 8.7 per cent of admissions for all causes in which alcohol figured. The report shows there were 509 patients newly admitted directly because of alcoholic insanity, while alcohol contributed to the condition of 243 other cases—a total of 752.

The report shows that alcohol was a contributing factor of varying extent in numerous medical cases, dementia praecox, so-called, the largest single group, representing an economic loss of \$61,907,331. The ratio of recovery in this group was low, and the economic loss to the patient was rated at 75 per cent of his future earning power.

Statistical data kept by the department over a 20-year period indicates the effects of the use of alcohol are cumulative, leading to mental breakdowns, generally between the ages of 30 and 50.

Of the total population in the state institutions on June 30 last, the number of alcoholic insane numbered 1,798. The dementia praecox group, numbering 27,875, comprises 57.4 per cent of the total.—*Christian Science Monitor*.

#### ROGER BABSON ON THE ECONOMIES OF PROHIBITION

Of the \$2,000,000,000 formerly spent each year for liquor, Mr. Babson estimates that aside from a very

small portion still spent for bootleg liquor, 25 per cent of this money is now being deposited in banks or other saving agencies, another 25 per cent going into homes, another 25 per cent into automobiles, and the remaining 25 per cent into miscellaneous merchandise.

The portion of the \$2,000,000,000 annual drink bill which remains undiverted from its former wet channel, Mr. Babson estimates as probably not more than 10 per cent. This would leave approximately \$7,800,000,000 to go into channels of bank savings, housing, automobiles and general merchandise.

But to this Mr. Babson adds the increased earning power of millions of workmen and consequently the increased buying power of more efficient labor. "When a man spends a dollar for liquor, he loses also \$4.00 in efficiency, so that the total waste is likely \$5.00," said Mr. Babson. "If you think \$4.00 is a high value, remember that the average wage of skilled men in this country is \$40 a week, and a man losing one day because of drink loses directly more than \$6.00 in wages alone."

"In advancing the workers' standard of living, prohibition has increased the dependability of labor generally," said Mr. Babson. "These rising standards must be reflected in the prosperity of the country. It makes little difference how much natural wealth a country may have. It takes men of ability and character to cash in these values. The present prosperity of the United States is in a great measure a reflection of the higher moral standards and ability of the American workman, an improvement in which prohibition bulks large as a contributing factor."

Mr. Babson sums up his conclusions thus:

1. "Approximately \$2,000,000,000 which was formerly spent for drink every year is now diverted into genuinely productive commerce and industry.

2. "The productive capacity of labor is increased at least 10 per cent. Thereby the earning power of labor is increased to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

3. "This doubly augmented buying power—that is, the money formerly spent for liquor, plus the increased earnings of sobriety—is greatly enlarging the markets of new and old lines of constructive business.

4. "Likewise, through the larger incomes and the consequently increased buying power, a higher standard of living is established.

5. "Millions of workingmen have become able to establish a credit and so to enjoy added purchasing power and added comforts of living through credit buying."—*From the International Student.*

#### LABOR LEADER AND GARMENT MANUFACTURER AGREE ON BENEFITS

Mr. Henry White, editor of the Clothing Trade Journal, and former head of the United Garment Workers of America, has this to say::

"The shutting off of the legalized liquor supply immediately diverted two billion dollars from booze into useful channels. A goodly proportion of this money has gone into more and better clothing. Sober men deck their wives out decently, buy good garments for their children, and are careful of their own appearance. You don't have to go farther than New York City to see the change that has been wrought in this trade and that can be attributed directly to prohibition. More than seven thousand saloons have been closed. These occupied important corners and were thrown on the market at a time when there was a pressing demand for real estate. To my knowledge, more than two hundred of these have been taken over by retail clothing and furnishing stores. High wages have given people more money, but the closing of the saloons has shown them how to use it. Cheap materials, ill-fitting and badly cut garments are no longer tolerated. People are willing to pay for good workmanship and they take pride in being well dressed. Any manufacturer of garments will tell the same story if he is honest about it."

Mr. Henry Simon, an expert of the garment manufacturers, sees it from the following standpoint:

"Today the manufacturer is not limited in his output by restrictions to meet the demand for cheap garments. Yardage does not count—the manufacturer is not obliged to skimp. Comfort, utility and style are the prime factors in production. There is no doubt that this higher standard of dressing is directly due to the transfer of money from booze to clothes."

'Factory conditions are easier. The grouchy foreman with a hangover jag has disappeared. 'Blue Mondays' are conspicuously absent. Though the clothing trade was not made up of the heavy drinking class, its sectional system creates a bad condition when even one or two employees are out. The output can be decreased fifty per cent by the absence of a couple of

workers. This was frequently the case in the old days of Saturdaysprees and Monday hangovers. The workers, themselves, are keener and more interested in their trade. This is shown by the increased sale of technical books on designing and cutting."

"Salesmanship is more expert than before prohibition. The old pernicious treating habit added to the cost of clothing. The consumer paid the bills for booze bought by the salesman for the buyer. When it was necessary to befuddle a man's brain before he bought your goods or to get him actually drunk, naturally the goods couldn't stand up under sober inspection. Today goods are sold on merit and the maker meets competition on this ground only."



"President Hoover in his inaugural address emphasized the need of an urgent respect for law and the improved treatment of crime and criminals. In his address to the commission on its organization he said: 'A nation does not fall from its growth in wealth or power, but no nation can for long survive failure of its citizens to respect and obey the laws which they themselves make, nor can it survive a decadence of the moral and spiritual contracts that are the basis of respect for laws, nor from neglect to organize itself. To defeat crime and the corruption that flows from it, he expressed the hope that the commission shall secure an accurate determination of the effect and cause, following them with constructive, courageous conclusions which will bring public understanding and command public support of its conclusions.

## PROHIBITION AT ITS WORST

The following facts and figures are taken from Professor Irving Fisher's new book, "Prohibition Still at Its Worst." It is published by the Alcohol Information Committee at 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, and sold for \$1.50. All profits from its sale go to the committee. It is a "follow-up" to the author's volume entitled "Prohibition at Its Worst," deals with criticism of that book and gives impartially the claim of the wets on each proposition treated. These two books are indispensable to those who would know and knowing give the public the facts.

The book states that the price of alcoholic beverages has "mounted to from treble to sevenfold the price of 1916," and that the classes that can afford to drink them "belong mainly to the upper middle and richest

classes, with incomes above \$2,600 per standard family of five, constituting only one-fifth of the population of the United States." The book also quotes Robbins B. Stoeckel, Commissioner of Motor Vehicles of Connecticut, and Canadian authorities to the effect that on the public highways moderate drinking is probably more dangerous than immoderate, and that the "really dangerous driver is the man who has had one or two drinks only, who still thinks he is in possession of his faculties, but his driving judgment has been impaired."

The Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor found in its study of the trends of alcoholism among the fathers of 2,378 children, confirmation for another study, made by the Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, which showed that previous to national prohibition intemperance was found in the homes of 47.7 per cent of the families coming under the care of that society. Under prohibition, in 1921, the percentage decreased to 16.8 per cent, arose to 23.2 in 1923, and dropped to 18.9 per cent in 1925. The Children's Bureau found "a decline in delinquent children committed to institutions," and that "contrary to opinions which have been expressed there seems to have been no marked decrease in age of commitment." The increase in this district has come between the ages of thirty-five and forty-four.

\* \* \*

There is much talk about drinking in the high schools. An inquiry addressed to the school principals of all the chief high schools in the wet state of Connecticut received the uniform reply that "drink is not a problem in the discipline of the school." Two-thirds of them replied that it was not even a problem in the social life of the school. One hundred city school superintendents from all over the nation replied to a like inquiry, as also one hundred college presidents, that such drinking as there had been was diminishing and that student drinking was no longer an important factor.

\* \* \*

The Salvation Army reports that there is far less drinking among youth than before prohibition. Evangeline Booth says in a pamphlet entitled "Some Have Stopped Drinking," that "it is the old fellows who still drink. Prohibition did not cure their appetite for alcohol." Concerning drinking among women, she

says that in ten rescue homes in the chief eastern cities, "there are no more than half-a-dozen inmates whose situations are complicated by an addiction to beer or wine or whisky."

\* \* \*

The wets point out that there has been a considerable increase in the death rate from alcohol since 1920. The comparison with 1920 is unfair, because after the strict enforcement of war-time prohibition and the beginning of national prohibition, all data showed striking decrease in the evil results of drinking. The proper comparison is with pre-war and pre-prohibition days. This comparison shows a great decrease in the number of deaths from alcoholism except in those centers where bootlegging thrives in the most lawless manner. The rates in Maryland and New York equal those of pre-war periods. The rates in the dry states are cut squarely in two and in the United States at large, including both wet and dry districts, there is a decrease of 50 per cent.

\* \* \*

Dr. Dublin, Health Statistician for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, says that the report from the army of agents, social workers and other representatives "from one end of the country to the other virtually are in accord that the years of prohibition have seen an improvement in the economic condition of the homes of the great mass of the American people," and he believes "that the 10 per cent of the wages which under the old regime went into the liquor traffic are largely diverted now into channels which mean increased protection and welfare for the family." He notes a decrease in the death rate for those under middle age and for women and children especially, but warns regarding the increase among men in the latter part of life. There is no doubt that cirrhosis of the liver and alcoholic psychosis have greatly increased among drinking men and register high in the later years of their lives due to the deleterious quality of the liquor they now drink. This is not an argument against prohibition but in favor of the more adequate enforcement of prohibition. Dr. Dublin concludes, "We may then say that the effect of the prohibition situation on public health has probably been good where there has been prohibition to an appreciable degree and the situation has been not satisfactory to the degree in which there has in fact been no prohibition."

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company finds the tuberculosis death rate higher where there is most infraction of the law and consequent consumption of bootleg liquor. They find also that the foreign born in the cities are those most affected by alcoholism, contributing twice as large a percentage of alcoholic psychosis as they do of population. A census study made in 1923 reported a ratio in the country at large for admission to hospitals for alcoholic psychosis decreased to one-third the rate in 1910. "The decline has been brought about by the habits of the people with respect to drinking and by the Eighteenth Amendment and laws prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages.

A table compiled by Cora Frances Stoddard, secretary of the Scientific Temperance Federation, covering the years from 1914 to 1927, and giving figures from practically all the wet states, as furnished by social welfare organizations, shows that two-thirds of them "had a lower percentage of intemperance by from 21 to 84 per cent than the average of their recorded pre-prohibition years. She also found that drunkenness as a factor in the cause of divorces has been reduced by one-half through prohibition.

#### PROFESSOR FISHER SUMS UP

In "Prohibition at Its Worst," Prof. Fisher summed up as follows:

(1) Present conditions are intolerable and must be corrected.

(2) Even so, they are not as dark as they have been painted. Moreover, if we do ultimately correct them, they are now in the nature of temporary evils, destined to fade away in a few years, while the good from prohibition will go on indefinitely.

(3) A great net good is already being realized, including over six billion dollars a year in cold cash values.

(4) Real personal liberty, the liberty to live and enjoy the full use of our faculties, is increased by prohibition.

(5) Light wines and beer cannot be legalized without another Constitutional amendment.

(6) No such amendment can be passed.

(7) All that the wets can possibly accomplish is laxity of enforcement or nullification; in other words, enormously to increase the very disrespect for law which they profess to deplore.

(8) Therefore, the only satisfactory solution lies in fuller enforcement.

(9) This can be accomplished, especially with the aid of education—when we “face the facts.”

Prohibition is here to stay. If not enforced, its blessings will speedily turn into a curse. There is no time to lose. Although things are much better than before prohibition with the possible exception of disrespect for law, they may not stay so. Enforcement will cure disrespect for law and other evils complained of, as well as greatly augment the good. American prohibition will then go down in history as ushering in a new era in the world, in which accomplishment this nation will take pride forever.

\* \* \*

In “Prohibition Still at Its Worst,” he comes to the following conclusions:

“What, then, is the situation today? . . . Prohibition is admittedly not yet out of its worst period. But it symbolizes the freeing of a nation from the toilsome drudgeries of its ancestors and from their drowning of their sorrows in drink. Even in the opinion of the wets, the saloon is banished forever. The period of the trial of Federal prohibition by the civil service has begun. The people, attracted by the healthful diversions of a life of ordered industry and growing leisure, have thus far by their votes fully ratified the beliefs in which a searching and impartial study has confirmed us, as follows:

“(1) Present conditions of law enforcement under national prohibition are intolerable and must be corrected.

“(2) Even so, they are not so dark as they have been painted. Moreover, if we do ultimately correct them, they are now in the nature of temporary evils, destined to fade away in a few years, while the good from prohibition will go on indefinitely. Mrs. Elizabeth Tilton does well in calling attention to the length of time taken for the effectual prohibition of the African slave trade—from 1807, when it was legally abolished, to 1871, when the last act was passed to enforce the law. William Allen White points to the generation needed for making prohibition of the liquor traffic effective in Kansas. A period of eight years for the nation is short indeed, and, in view of the material and spiritual gains attainable, thrice that number of years spent in more effective enforcement and public education would be well rewarded.

"(3) Prohibition has already accomplished incalculable good, hygienically, economically, and socially.

"(4) Real personal liberty, the liberty to live and enjoy the full use of our facilities, is increased by prohibition.

"(5) Light wines and beer cannot be legalized without another Constitutional amendment.

"(6) No such amendment can be passed.

"(7) All that the wets can possibly accomplish is laxity of enforcement, or nullification; in other words, enormously to increase the very disrespect for law which they profess to deplore.

"(8) Therefore, the only satisfactory solution lies in fuller enforcement."

#### NOTED PHYSICIAN SUMS UP VS. JOHN BARLEYCORN

Dr. Haven Emerson, one of our most noted authorities on preventive medicine, challenges temperance organizations to get busy, collect the facts and prove the social benefits of prohibition. He sums up the medical score against alcohol as follows in an article in the Survey Magazine:

Alcohol is a depressant habit-forming narcotic drug.

Alcohol is a protoplasmic poison.

Alcohol is drunk to get the drug effect and whenever it is so taken in whatever amount it exerts to some degree its depressant and toxic effects.

Alcohol causes disease: psychosis, multiple neuritis, gastritis, cirrhosis of the liver.

Alcohol causes deaths: from acute and chronic poisoning.

Alcohol causes deaths: from acute and chronic poisoning.

Alcohol reduces resistance to infection.

Alcohol diminishes likelihood of recovery from acute infections, such as pneumonia.

Alcohol increases liability to accidents, and delays recovery.

Alcohol reduces endurance, accuracy and rapidity of muscular action of all kinds even when used in such small amounts as to show effects inappreciable subjectively by the user.

Alcohol decreases expectation of life.

Alcohol reduces chance and survival of offspring.

Alcohol deteriorates emotional and nervous control, as expressed in unreliable judgment and self-control and hence contributes to the incidence of venereal diseases.

No kind of test involving conscious cerebration or reflex or voluntary muscular mechanism has yet been evolved which does not show one or all of the following results from even minimum physiological doses of alcohol, as compared to the response of a normal or non-alcoholized individual: delay, inaccuracy, lack of endurance, i. e., slower, weaker, more irregular response.

## THE CANADIAN PLAN

Many honest folk, many of them favorable to prohibition, believe that we voted in National prohibition too soon. They think it useless and wrong to impose laws upon a rank and file in large populations who have not been morally convinced of their legitimacy and value. These people look to the Canadian Plan as a better method for those districts not yet ready to vote prohibition upon themselves.

Such a viewpoint is quite legitimate if it really offers a better measure of temperance and of law enforcement than does national prohibition. The question is: Does it? No one is willing to advocate the return of the American saloon and to have abolished the old American saloon is in itself a victory.

The adoption of the Canadian plan would not necessitate any change in present state and local option prohibition areas in this country. It would require an amendment of the Eighteenth Amendment, but unless the Hoover administration succeeds in enforcing prohibition in our wet centers the Canadian Plan will win millions of voters in some future national campaign.

## THE FIGURES ON THE CANADIAN PLAN

Professors Y. W. Moffit of Manitoba and J. T. Culliton of Montreal, after thorough research, give out the following statistics:

With some violent fluctuations the manufacture of spirits rose from 2,356,000 gallons in 1920 to 11,596,000 gallons in 1928. The manufacture of malt liquors in the same period rose from 36,984,000 gallons to 58,397,000 gallons, and the wines from 421,000 gallons to 4,305,000 gallons.

From the low figure of \$8,500,000 in 1919, the Dominion revenue from excise and customs duties and taxes on alcoholic beverages increased to \$49,775,000 in 1928. In 1920 the provinces received from liquor traffic revenues \$3,837,000, while in 1928 the corresponding figure was \$22,755,000.

Criminal statistics relating to the liquor traffic show that convictions from indictable offenses decreased in the early years of the war by some 27 per cent and then began to rise. From 1923 there was a steady increase, reaching a higher total in 1928 than in the year ending September 30, 1914. Convictions for "driving an auto while intoxicated" grew from 142 in 1921 to 1,322 in 1928, while the number of motor cars registered in Canada was slightly more than doubled. The proportion of immoderate drinkers among those whose use of liquor is recorded fell from 29.6 per cent in 1914 to 9.9 per cent in 1923, and had risen by 1928 to 14.4 per cent.

Convictions for drunkenness have increased from 21,626 in 1918 to 33,095 in 1928. Infractions of the liquor laws increased from 7,383 in 1919 to 15,150 in 1928.

Deaths from alcoholism, excluding Quebec, whose figures are not available prior to 1926, have more than doubled in the seven years, 1921-1928. The total number of deaths specified as "alcoholic" in 1928 was 228 as compared with 82 deaths in 1921.

#### DOES GOVERNMENT CONTROL LIQUOR OR LIQUOR CONTROL GOVERNMENT?

Buffalo has a citizens' committee of 10,000 for law enforcement. It sums up the Canadian Plan in this way:

Not the amount of liquor drunk, for Ontario is buying liquor at the rate of \$1,000,000 a week.—Ontario Liquor Board. In Alberta, 4,000,000 gallons of liquor sold in second year of "control."—Alberta Liquor Board. "Sales of beer increased 1,000,000 gallons over last year."—Quebec Liquor Commission. The seven provinces having "government control," with a population of 10,000,000, spend \$160,000,000 a year for liquor.—Reports of the seven liquor control boards.

Not the sale of hard liquor, for "since the opening of the beer parlors the sale of hard liquors increased 50 per cent."—British Columbia Liquor Board. Sale of hard spirits increased 32,275 gallons in one year.—Quebec Liquor Commission. Sale of hard liquor increased 33 per cent in last two years.—Saskatchewan Liquor Board, 1927.

Not the number of persons drinking—Alberta issued 60,000 permits the first year; two years later she issued 144,000 permits—Alberta Liquor Board. In Ontario 220,440 permits were issued in first four months.—Ontario Liquor Board.

# To Disciple Ministers:

Our General Convention Committee  
Designated Sunday

February 23rd As Temperance Sunday

This special number of Social Trends will, we trust, be of value to you.

We would like to see 10,000 copies distributed at church doors.

Won't you lend a hand by ordering as many as you reasonably think your people will take at 10c per copy? Addressed card is enclosed for your convenience.

Order now, announce them when they come, and have some one deeply interested take charge of them. Any time will do for the distribution—**only send us your order now**, so we will know how many to have printed.

They cost us 10c apiece to print and mail. We wish we had the funds to send them for free distribution, but we have not, so this request for cooperation.

Sincerely,

ALVA W. TAYLOR, *Secretary*,

*Board of Temperance and Social Welfare.*



Not drunkenness—"Drunkenness among women increased 54 per cent."—Montreal Star. "If all the drunks were arrested there would be no room for them in the jails."—Police Commissioner C. F. Burton of Manitoba. "Arrests for drunkenness increased 125 per cent in first eight months."—Saskatchewan Liquor Board. "All records for inebriates were broken today when 89 Labor Day celebrants faced Magistrate Cohen."—Toronto Star.

Not bootlegging—"Our greatest problem is moonshine in the country districts"—Alberta Liquor Board. "Bootlegging increased 111 per cent in first year."—Saskatchewan Liquor Board. "As much liquor is sold by bootleggers as is sold in the government stores."—British Columbia Liquor Board.

Many Canadians are discovering instead of liquor being controlled by the government, the government is being controlled by liquor.

#### THE CANADIAN PLAN AND THE BOOTLEGGER

Reviewing "Prohibition or Control," by R. E. Hose, in Moral Welfare, Cora Frances Stoddard finds that

"Canada has the bootlegger, and the bootlegger operating with at least one advantage that he does not have in the United States. Here his transactions involve a double hazard; he buys in an illegal transaction; he sells illegally. At either point, the enforcement official is liable to interrupt. Mr. Hose admits that Canadian government sale reduces by half this hazard of the bootlegger.

As long as there are any limitations on hours, conditions and amounts of sale, somebody will choose not to conform and thus afford a market for the bootlegger.

He quotes (page 57) from the British Columbia Commission's second report: "The bootlegger has proved his ability to provide increasing embarrassment to all classes of officials directly or indirectly concerned with the administration of liquor laws." Quebec and Manitoba have taken over the "Padlock" law (page 62) in an effort to "strike at the investments of those who connive at bootlegging."

And who patronizes the bootlegger? Apparently about the same class that in the United States asserts its right to break the prohibition law. "The greater proportion of the bootleggers' patrons," says Mr. Hose (page 61) 'are not the sort who are really addicted to heavy drinking or who come into conflict with the

police. Roughly speaking, they break up into three groups—the well-to-do itinerant hotel guest, tourist, or resident who wishes to buy the bottle after the stores are closed, the ‘odd-shot’ man and his friends in whom the habit of treating at the bar is too deep-seated to have been eradicated, and the casual joy-rider dance hall type whose hip-pocket flask has given out.”

In other words, with abundant opportunity to buy liquor of all sorts, the appetite of those who choose not to conform to the regulations laid down for its sale enables the bootlegger to flourish and to profit.

Mr. Hose’s pages frankly reveal the failure of this plan to eliminate the bootlegger and his adulterated liquor, the home brewer, the smuggler, the illicit activities of trade brewers and of malcontent drinkers. To be sure, he makes the few years of antecedent prohibition in Canada rather than the Canadian system responsible for the development of the “bootlegger.” Is the bootlegger really so recent as that? One thinks not, if the origin of the term is recalled. How long since any of my readers looked upon the type of foot-gear that gave rise to it?

#### EDITOR OF TORONTO GLOBE ON THE CANADIAN PLAN

Gifford Gordon asked Elmore Philpott, editor of the Toronto Globe, seven critical questions regarding the Canadian plan of government control and received categorical replies as follows:

1. Is it your opinion that government control makes for real temperance?

Reply. No.

2. Does government control decrease or increase the consumption of liquor?

Reply. Liquor consumption has doubled in Ontario in two years.

3. Does government control decrease or increase number of drunken drivers of automobiles?

Reply. Drunken drivers have multiplied by ten, while cars doubled.

4. Have deaths from accidents due to drunken drivers increased under government control?

Reply. Yes, enormously.

5. Have industrial accidents decreased under government control?

Reply. No. Increasing 7 per cent faster than pay rolls.

6. Has government control eliminated the bootlegger?

Reply. Large bootlegger eliminated, but small bootlegger multiplied.

7. Has government control proved any benefit to the young people?

Reply. No.

## THE TORONTO GLOBE SUMS UP

The Dominion Bureau of statistics has issued an official report on crime. The Globe analyzes this report and sums up as follows:

"By far the worst feature of the report is the irrefutable figures set forth showing the close relationship that exists between increased consumption of alcohol and an increase in crime.

"Convictions for indictable offenses have steadily risen since the war with the coming of the greater facilities for obtaining liquor. The number of convictions for 'illicit stills,' first separated from other Inland Revenue Act offenses in 1921, reached a peak of 1,068 in 1923, and declined to 291 in 1928. Convictions for 'driving an auto while intoxicated' grew from 142 in 1921 to 1,322 in 1928, while the number of motor cars registered in Canada was slightly more than doubled. The proportion of immoderate drinkers among those whose use of liquors is recorded fell from 19.9 per cent in 1914 to 9.9 per cent in 1923, and had risen by 1928 to 14.4 per cent.

### *Drunkenness Increases*

"Convictions for drunkenness have increased from 21,026 in 1918 to 33,095 in 1928, although still far short of the pre-war figures of more than 60,000 in 1913. Infractions of the liquor laws increased from 7,383 in 1919 to 15,150 in 1928.

"The report records a steady increase in the number of deaths listed as caused by alcoholism, and also in the proportion they bear to the total. Deaths from alcoholism (excluding Quebec) have more than doubled in the seven years tabulated. The total deaths from cirrhosis of the liver show a similar increase. A slight decrease in the other Provinces in 1926 and 1927 is more than offset by the large number of deaths from this cause in Quebec.

"No less illuminating are the figures shown in the report of the colossal sums spent each year on liquor. The total sales throughout the Dominion for the past year amounted to \$107,694,484. The total Govern-

ment revenue from this expenditure was \$72,560,501, and the sum that came to swell the coffers of the various Provinces amounted to \$22,755,210. In the Provinces of Ontario alone in 1928 the gross value of liquor sold is placed at \$48,955,591. The revenue derived by the Ferguson Government from its policy of 'liquor control' was \$8,130,390.

"The economic loss that these figures spell to the country cannot be computed.

"The same story is told in every Province of the operation of the Government sale of liquor. It has resulted in increased drinking, in increased crime, in an increase of danger to human life through the operation of automobiles by drunken drivers. It has not fulfilled one of the many promises that were held out for it. The drunkard still reels in the streets, the bootlegger plies his nefarious trade, the illicit still is with us yet."

#### THE RUM RUNNER, CANADA, AND UNCLE SAM'S ENFORCEMENT

Commenting upon border smuggling, the Toronto Globe on July 28th last said:

"The situation simply boils down to this: The Canadian government is simply operating in collusion with outlaw American citizens to break United States laws. It is a blunt way of putting it; but is it not the fact?"

In a close, first hand study of the situation at Detroit, Morrow Mayo wrote in the Nation of September 4th, 1929:

"When the rum-running boats are loaded and ready to go, they are formally cleared by Canadian customs officials. The documents give the name of the distillery, transporter, exact cargo and time of departure. Copies are mailed to the customs office at port of destination. Having cleared from Windsor, the boats run out into the river, remaining on the Canadian side until they get an opportunity to make the dash to the United States shore. Part of this shore is occupied by private boat-wells, one after another, built on private property. Along the river's edge there are whole blocks of houses, built close together, boarded between, and surrounded by high fences. The view from both the river and the land is completely obstructed. Doors that extend beneath the surface of the water lift up and descend to emit and admit the rum-running boats. Search warrants are required to enter these private houses. They have private automobile entrances and garages. Innumerable streets lead down to the river's

edge. The boats usually shoot across at night. Running in pitch darkness without lights, it takes a rum-running boat from one to three minutes to make the half-mile dash from Canadian waters to the United States shore.

United States authorities are not permitted to chase rum boats in Canadian waters. Theoretically, a rum-runner could run up and down the Detroit River a few feet from a United States patrol boat, and be immune from arrest. That is exactly what the boats often do, shooting at each other, the rum-runners aware that they may get shot but cannot be arrested, the patrolmen aware that they may get shot but cannot make an arrest. This situation amounts to a river war, with engagements of one kind or another every day. Here is the first paragraph of a story from the front page of the Detroit News of August 9:

"Rum runners and coast guardsmen fought a pitched battle on the Detroit River off Ecourse shore early today, racing along the middle of the river less than 100 feet apart and exchanging rifle and pistol shots. No one was injured, although two of the coast guard agents narrowly escaped. The runners escaped to Canada with their cargo."

Of the seven government (on the border) agencies, the personnel of three wear civilian clothes, the others wear four different kinds of uniforms. The average salary of these men is \$43.54 a week. Each force has certain restricted duties and varying limited authority. Each is governed by its own regulations. Each is responsible to a different active boss. There is a coordinator in the area. He is a customs man and is practically unknown to the other agencies. There is very little co-ordination and less co-operation. On the contrary, there is jealousy and open hostility. Each force is trying to make the best showing. The two prohibition forces do not pull together or get along with the customs men. The three customs forces do not work together, or with the prohibition men. The coast guard and immigration forces work independently, and "high hat" the other five. Andrew Mellon is the official head of all seven agencies.

It may be stated without fear of contradiction that the United States has never made a sincere, determined effort to stop liquor smuggling from Canada, and is not making one now. To put it most charitably, its effort has been half-hearted. If any one doubts this, let him ask himself the question: What would the

United States do if the commodity being so openly and notoriously smuggled into the country were an article upon which there is a high tariff?

## BY THE WAY

### WHERE THE COLLEGE STUDENTS STAND

Professor E. E. Carlright, Professor of Education in New York University, made an inquiry regarding how college students stand on the Eighteenth Amendment. Referendum of classes were taken, most of them seniors, with the following results:

1. Should the Eighteenth Amendment be rigidly enforced?

Mt. Holyoke College group, 97 per cent YES.

Stanford University group, 94 per cent YES.

University of Minnesota group, 88 per cent YES.

Connecticut College group, 87 per cent YES.

University of Michigan group, 84 per cent YES.

Washington Square, N. Y. U. group, 80 per cent YES.

Smith College group, 70 per cent YES.

Education, N. Y. U. group, 68 per cent YES.

Amherst College group, 64 per cent YES.

University of Texas group, 64 per cent YES.

University of North Carolina group, 72 per cent YES.

Commerce, N. Y. U. group, 72 per cent YES.

Kentucky Wesleyan group (Methodist) 100 per cent YES.

Westminster College group (Presbyterian), 100 per cent YES.

Bonebrake Seminary group (Theological), 100 per cent YES.

Colorado College group (Agricultural), 96 per cent YES.

University of Buffalo group (Dentistry), 95 per cent YES.

Agnes Scott College group (Presbyterian), 89 per cent YES.

University of Tennessee group (Dentistry), 89 per cent YES.

University of Rochester group (Medical), 86 per cent YES.

Hampden-Sidney group (Presbyterian), 85 per cent YES.

University of Maryland group (College), 84 per cent YES.

North Dakota State group (Agricultural), 80 per cent YES.

St. Mary's group (Catholic), 80 per cent YES.

University of Utah group (College), 73 per cent YES.

#### LEADERS IN 1,000 CITIES:

Charles Stelzle interviewed leaders in 1,000 cities "solely to determine what Americans really think of Prohibition today." A majority of newspaper editors reported a favorable attitude toward both the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. Of three hundred editors interviewed, 75 per cent favored the Amendment and 61 per cent the enforcement act.

"On the whole, there was practically no difference of opinion as to the economic benefit of prohibition; even among those who are most strenuously opposed to the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act, and however inadequately the law may have been enforced, the general opinion seems to be that prohibition has resulted in a higher level of living for all classes in the country."

Speaking of college drinking, Dr. Stelzle declared that reports of excesses in this field were much exaggerated. *Prohibition has not been a failure, and the sentiment of the country is not opposed to it*, is the conclusion of his survey.

#### A SINCERE, NOTABLE OPPONENT ON BREAKING THE LAW

Norman Hapgood is an able publicist and a notable humanitarian. He believes we would get more effective temperance legislation through local option, but he reads the wets a stern rebuke on their lawlessness:

"The amendment, mistaken as it is, was passed after decades of consideration. It is believed in by a large part of the population. Disobedience to it on a small local scale is only what we have been used to for centuries where liquor taxes were being avoided. The big modern American organization to beat the amendment is a genuine menace. It is creating criminals by the thousands, and our dress suit and dinner party class are taking the lead in planting the criminal mind in their own children."

"They have a hard time justifying it. They show a

good deal more heat than light. Their degree of disinterested moral conviction may be considerable, like that of the parents who object to the child labor laws, or school attendance laws, or vaccination rules, but conviction is not their motive power. The motive power is the desire to get the booze or keep up with the momentary conventions in their set."

"For my part I have more respect for a person who admits he is paying a stiff price for whisky, one-third representing the whisky, and two-thirds representing what is paid the bootlegger for the trouble and danger of committing perjury, forgery, bribery, and occasional murder, than I have for a person who pretends he is making a sacred effort in behalf of human freedom and against oppression. For that is complete bunk."

"The Eighteenth Amendment to my thinking was a mistake. I am not discussing the best way of undoing that mistake. Repeal or amendment of the amendment would be the best method, if our Constitution did not make it all but impossible. That being practically impossible, however, some device will be worked out, as was done in the case of voting in the South, whereby local expression, in interpretation or execution, will be the final answer."

"If we mean prohibition, when we ask whether an unjust law should be obeyed, the best answer is to take a little look at those who are breaking down the law, and ask ourselves if they have the appearance of moral martyrs, making sacrifices for a principle. The lead in the lawbreaking has been taken by the self-indulgent rich, or well-to-do. The home brew of the miner is not important."

#### WHO BREAKS THE PROHIBITION LAW?

Mr. Walton Green, in an article in the Saturday Evening Post, calls attention to the class of citizens who, in the large wet cities, furnish the major portion of the law violators. Radical drys point the moral that these people are not good Americans; local optionists believe we should make them dry by education instead of by legislation. We misuse these statistics when we fail to point out that more than 70 per cent of the population in most of these cities is foreign born and the children of foreign born.

"Only in the South Atlantic States is there a preponderance of native violators over foreign born, and that is accounted for by the great number of native-

born negroes in the rum business. In all other sections of the country the alien is the chief offender. Philadelphia violators are 80 per cent foreign born, Chicago 60 per cent, San Francisco 79 per cent, Pittsburgh 55 per cent, Los Angeles 68 per cent, and New York 85 per cent."

Mr. Green calls attention to the fact that there are only about three thousand men employed by the Federal Government to control the Prohibition situation. He says:

"The New York police force is five times as large as the entire Federal prohibition unit; and New York spends about \$35,000,000 a year on its police force, compared with some \$11,000,000 which the United States spends on interior enforcement."

\* \* \*

Statistics by states on the percentage of foreign born and children of foreign born who break the law are furnished by prohibition officials: Arizona 85 per cent, Connecticut 90 per cent, California 85 per cent, Colorado 52 per cent, Maryland 75 per cent, Georgia 5 per cent, Idaho 10 per cent, Iowa 10 per cent, Illinois 90 per cent, Louisiana 10 per cent, Missouri 88 per cent, Nevada 50 per cent, New Mexico 4 per cent, New Jersey 65 per cent, New York 50 per cent, Utah 80 per cent, Vermont 45 per cent, Washington 28 per cent, Wisconsin 90 per cent, Wyoming 50 per cent.

A classification of persons sentenced under the Volstead Act in the Northern Division of the Eastern District of Michigan during the October term of court, 1926, is perhaps fairly typical of the country as a whole except for the great cities. The report shows the following:

Total number sentenced, 433 (male, 368; female, 65); alien born, not naturalized, 102; alien born, naturalized, 37; American born, 2; alien born parents, 77; American born, 1 alien born parent, 30; American born, 2 American born parents, 187; repeaters from federal court, 32; repeaters from state courts, 122; under 30 years of age, 113; 30 years of age and over, 320.

Education: Never attended school, 51; 8 grades or less, 322; more than 8 grades and less than 12, 58; high school graduates, 2.

#### THE PRICE AND QUALITY OF BOOTLEG LIQUOR

Prof. Irving Fisher furnishes the following table on the price of bootleg liquor, "the result of an inves-

tigation in which commissioners of half of the prohibition administrative districts of the country participated."

	Average Price Per Quart		Inc. %
	1916	1928	
Lager beer -----	\$ .10	\$ .80	600
Home brew -----		.60	
Rye whisky -----	1.70	7.00	310
Corn whisky -----		3.95	147
"White Mule" bootleg whisky--		3.20	100
Gin -----	.95	5.90	520
Gin (synthetic) -----		3.65	285
Brandy -----	1.80	7.00	290
Port wine -----	.60	3.90	550
Sherry -----	.60	4.32	600
Claret -----	.80	3.00	200

The Christian Science Monitor sums up the report of the State Chemist of Massachusetts on bootleg as follows:

"Analysis of 1,975 samples of liquor captured from bootleggers in Massachusetts during the last three months shows more than 5 per cent containing wood alcohol, with many others holding impure substances and the samples as a whole the 'worst ever seen by the department,' it is declared in a report by Hermann C. Lythgoe, Massachusetts State Chemist."

"Entirely exclusive of the samples containing wood alcohol, according to Mr. Lythgoe, others, classified as 'peculiar samples,' contained materials ranging from kerosene to toluene, from which T.N.T. is made."

"Listing these 'peculiar samples' of so-called liquor, Mr. Lythgoe showed that among them five were composed of completely denatured alcohol, three of diluted and clarified denatured alcohol, two were flavored with anise oil and one with kerosene oil, two contained a commercial antiseptic, while one consisted entirely of glycerine.

"One sample, he continued, contained 40 per cent by volume of toluene, and another 60 per cent by volume. Still another contained 16 per cent of alcohol together with a large quantity of blue coloring matter."

#### WHO AND WHAT WON PROHIBITION

Robert A. Woods, noted social settlement worker of Boston, said:

"A most remarkable fact about the movement for national prohibition, looked at now from the point of view of its strong probability of success and the amazing economic and moral transformation which it will produce, is that, for its special promotion, it owes nothing to the accredited social-reform forces. With substantial accuracy it may be said social workers as a body have had toward it nothing more than the attitude of curious spectators. Yet it will, without doubt, accomplish within their own field more than the total result of all they can hope to achieve with their present programs. On the fingers of one hand can be counted the leaders of organized labor who have shown any kindly interest in what may even double or treble trade union resources and influence. Hardly even a ripple has been stirred upon the face of socialist discussion by this vast tendency which promises to accomplish the biggest result of deliberative collective action in the whole history of democracy.

"Making all allowances for the secondary influence of economic considerations, it is the plain church-going people of the towns and countryside who by their inherent moral force are bringing about this stupendous achievement."

#### ALCOHOL, THE BRAIN AND THE DRIVER

Henry Ford says "gasoline and booze don't mix." Dr. Courtenay C. Weeks, British medical authority, says:

"Alcohol numbs the cortex, dethrones, be it ever so slightly, the crown of evolutionary progress, dulls the pain, stills the conflict—but the cause remains. While the alcohol is at work the unfortunate sufferer is possessed by the euphoria which he calls 'stimulation.' The 'stimulation' is but the temporary and dearly bought relief from the consciousness of disharmony, it is but the other side of the paralysis of the higher. It is, in a sentence, simply the result of a deadening of the power of appreciation; it has secured a flight from reality into the illusion of narcosis.

"Alcohol does nothing, absolutely nothing, to remove the cause, although it deadens the power of appreciating the result. If its action be sought continuously or frequently, then deeper draughts are constantly called for, until at last, and, indeed, only too often, the euphoria ends in an anaesthesia to all that is highest and best."

Dr. Ernest Cherington comments as follows in "Prohibition and Education," which was inserted in the Congressional Record by consent:

"The railroads long ago recognized the needless hazard created by beverage intoxicants, and in their Rule G forbade their use by any employees either on or off duty. The same absolute abstinence is imperative for the aviator, the chauffeur, the operator of any of our high-speed machinery. It is a basic requirement for the surgeon. The steel worker, the telegraph operator, the motorman—in fact, practically the whole body of workers who do not labor isolated from their fellows—cannot with safety dull their minds and shatter their nerves by the partial paralysis. These truths need to be deeply impressed upon the minds of all who are studying the liquor problem. They do not constitute propaganda. They are basic facts. No purple language can disguise them. They merely express the undeniable truth that beverage alcohol has no place in this high-speed, closely interlocking civilization, but belongs to a slower and a lower mode of life."

#### PHILIP GIBBS VS. RAMSAY MACDONALD ON PROHIBITION IN THE UNITED STATES

Three years ago Philip Gibbs, the noted war correspondent, and Ramsay MacDonald both visited this country. The former returned to England to write the following:

"I went to a party in one of the best homes in a great city in the West and every woman there, including beautiful young girls, became hopelessly intoxicated before the evening was out. College boys carry flasks in their hip pockets and give drinking parties to girl friends. . . . Or if they cannot get drink, they get drugs, which are worse."

Now, of course, Sir Philip never saw this in one of our "best" homes. Only our worst homes, howsoever rich, ever allowed such things to happen. He should have been ashamed to confess he kept such company while here.

The New York World (wet) reported as follows on Ramsay MacDonald:

Ramsay MacDonald, former British Prime Minister, who will end a month's visit to the United States by sailing for home tonight on the Berengaria, believes that prohibition is a great praiseworthy effort to keep people decent and does not merit the sneers of visitors who find it a subject for smartness.

A little wane from his three weeks' illness but with ample spirit in his voice, Mr. MacDonald, who had said he would not permit himself to discuss any of the domestic affairs of the United States, broke his self-imposed restriction enough to declare he would take no part in the sneers of foreign visitors at prohibition.

"So many of our smart people have been over here and sneered at the law, but when I go back I am going to take the other side," he said. "It is a great effort to keep people decent and to enable men to find it easier to do their duty by their families and to spend their money on necessities."

While saying that his illness had prevented his seeing enough of the enforcement of prohibition to venture an opinion of this phase, the British labor leader said to the Associated Press that he would like to see a great moral appeal to all good citizens to respect the law.

"Read Plato on the sacredness of the law," he said.

"You think it is a good law?"

"I say it is a great effort, a great praiseworthy effort, and as I like great efforts I resent my fellow countrymen coming over here and sneering at it. I shall certainly take no part in that."

#### GHANDI'S FUNDAMENTAL DEMANDS FOR INDIA

The great Hindu saint stated his demands upon the British Colonial Government in the following words, some two years ago:

"I would dispel the illusion that I am inimical to capital, and that I would destroy machinery and its products if I had the power. The fact is, I am a confirmed protectionist. Free trade may be good for England, which dumps her manufactures among helpless people, and wishes her own wants to be supplied from outside at the cheapest rates. But free trade has ruined India's peasantry, in that it has all but destroyed her cottage industry. I would any day welcome protection for the India mills, although I would always give preference to hand-spun cotton cloth. Much of my opposition to the government would abate if I found that it was truly solicitous for India's economic and moral welfare. Let the government protect the cloth industry to the point of prohibition of all foreign cloth; let it popularize the spinning wheel by making all government purchases in hand-made cloth; let it abolish, without regard to rev-

enue, the drink and drug traffic; let it cut down the army expenditure to the extent of the loss of that revenue; and then, when such a happy event takes place, my opposition will lose its point. It will pave the way for a real discussion of the reforms. To me the two steps will be a striking sign of a change of heart, which must precede any honorable settlement."

Mr. C. F. Andrews, bosom friend of Ghandi, an Englishman who knows both Britain and India, summed up his attitude in this way:

During the time that I have been with him in his long illness a better opportunity has been given to me of understanding his practical program. The removal of "untouchability" and the promotion of "Hindu-Moslem unity" he regards as the greatest of all the Indian needs of the present day. The Reform Councils cannot touch these at all. In some ways the concentration of interest upon the Councils has thrown them back. But there are two things which the Councils can definitely deal with—namely (i.) protection of the cotton industry and (ii.) the prohibition of drink and drugs. It was originally the knowledge of this fact which made him put forward his offer of co-operation at the very height of the Non-Co-operation movement in 1921. "If the government of India," he then said, in so many words, "is prepared to co-operate with these two popular movements, (i.) the protection of our home cloth industry and (ii.) the prohibition of drink and drugs, then the people of India will forget the wrongs done to them in the past." It will be seen how almost exactly he has repeated the same offer today.

### THEY SAY

Justice William Howard Taft said:

"I am not in favor of amending the Volstead Act or allowing light wines and beer to be sold under the Eighteenth Amendment. I believe it would defeat the purpose of the amendment."

Theodore Roosevelt said:

"There isn't a thought in a hogshead of beer. There isn't an idea in a whole brewery. Nothing of merit has ever been written or done under the inspiration of lager beer. It stupefies without invigorating. Its effect upon the brain is to stagnate thought."

Hon. Edward Keating, former member of Congress, now editor of the great labor weekly, Labor, published in Washington, D. C., said:

"When it was proposed that the saloons should close their 'ladies' entrances,' the men proposing it were branded as fanatics and blue-nose reformers. When it was suggested that the saloon should be closed on Sunday, the same cry was raised. When laws were enacted to stop the sale of liquor to minors, we heard the same complaint. When local option was proposed, the liquor lobbies denounced us as seeking to curtail individual liberty. There was never a time when the liquor interests voluntarily submitted to any regulation, however reasonable."

Mr. Ernest Cherington says that the records of the city of Paris show that the arrests for all causes other than for intoxication increased between the years 1919 and 1924 by less than 20 per cent, while the arrests for intoxication during the same period increased by more than 75 per cent.

The convictions for intoxication per million population in New York in 1914 numbered 2,125; in London they were 4,058, and in Paris the arrests for intoxication per million of population were 4,719.

Professor Farnum, of Yale University, said:

"To put it briefly, the traffic was outlawed because, after many years of scientific study and a long experience in the effort to regulate the traffic, it was recognized by those who had the intelligence to learn, and whose personal tastes did not confuse their judgment, that the liquor business was in its essence a predatory business. I mean that, from the purely economic point of view, it preys upon productive industry, and, from the moral point of view, it preys upon the life, health and happiness of men, women and children."

Professor E. A. Ross, University of Wisconsin, said:

"It became a 'big business' intent on profits—always more profits. It no longer pleaded humbly for leave to assuage existing thirsts. In order to promote business it deliberately and methodically set itself to create new thirsts. . . . As production and distribution were centralized, the business grew more capitalistic and the saloonkeeper came to be the brewer's man, systematic efforts were made to 'shove' liquor, especially beer. . . . Continually they plotted to tempt the public into a large consumption. Their ambition seemed to be to convert the rising generation into peripatetic tanks."

Dr. Franklin H. Martin, president of the American College of Surgeons, says:

"In spite of the injudicious administration of this Eighteenth Amendment, which has resulted in an orgy of law-breaking, of self-indulgence and ridicule on the part of the other one-third of our citizens, the foundation has been laid for a demonstration of race betterment."

"The Eighteenth Amendment is already remaking the American people. If it is continued, and an administration is found that will judiciously enforce the law, making it appear ridiculous to drink, a great thing will have been done in the improvement of our race."

### WHAT TO READ

For a steady, dependable source of information on prohibition and on peace movements, read the *Christian Science Monitor* (Back Bay, Boston, \$9 per year, daily). Beginning May 5th, it will publish twenty articles on "The Why of Prohibition." A special price of \$1 is made for this series. It will be a complete, well-rounded and compact digest of the case for prohibition, in a form worth filing away for frequent reference.

A most excellent pamphlet is Nolan Best's "Yes, It's the Law and It's a Good Law." (Doran.)



In previous issues we have reviewed Martha Bensley Bruere's "Does Prohibition Work?" (Harper's), Harry S. Warner's "Prohibition: An Adventure in Freedom" (The American Issue Press, Westerville, Ohio), and Feldman's "Prohibition: Its Industrial and Economic Aspects." All are excellent books. The best of all books thus far are Irving Fisher's, to which attention is called at length in this issue.



For a small text, adapted for use in church, Sunday school, young people's and other groups, write Research Department, Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y.



The case for governmental control as a substitute for prohibition as a temperance measure is well, even enthusiastically, put by Rheta Childe Dorr in "Drink: Coercion or Control." (Stokes, \$2.50.) The author believes herself to be objective, unimpassioned and fair, presenting "a complete analysis of prohibition, not propaganda for or against, but facts—cold, incon-

trovertible." When she says "the average prohibitionist believes in total abstinence for his neighbor," she tells a truth with a meaning that is obviously insinuating rather than tolerant. When she says prohibition was "put over" on the American people, she judges them to be a nation of sleepy fools. When she charges that even the old prohibition states failed to enforce prohibition, she might have added that the ten commandments have never yet been enforced either and that murder is as old as Cain. When she assumes that prohibition is making us a nation of law-breakers, she simply assumes an overdone, partizan wet attitude. When she calls the dry churchman who lead in prohibition "popes," she says entirely too much to allow any one to believe her impartial. But, with all the bias shown, the book gives an excellent, though over-enthusiastic account of experiments in control in Canada, Britain, Scandinavia and elsewhere.



For pamphlets stating the case against prohibition write The Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, National Press Building, Washington, D. C., for any of these titles:

CANADA LIQUOR CROSSING THE BORDER

THEORY OF PROHIBITION

MEASURING THE LIQUOR TIDE

REPORT TO THE DIRECTORS, MEMBERS AND FRIENDS OF  
THE ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION  
AMENDMENT

THE QUEBEC SYSTEM, A Study in Liquor Control  
EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT NOT A REMEDY FOR THE  
DRINK EVIL

SCANDALS OF PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT

PROHIBITION PRO AND CON

GOVERNMENT LIQUOR CONTROL IN CANADA

THE LAST OUTPOSTS OF PROHIBITION IN CANADA

REFORMING AMERICA WITH A SHOTGUN



## HENRY FORD ON PROHIBITION

The "wets," so called, are as much a part of the prohibition movement as the "drys," and it will be the "wets" that shall at last make the country "dry."

Is this a paradox? Not at all. Only the exaggerations and excesses of the "wets" can put across a "dry" campaign. If this had been a sober country, we should never have had prohibition. If the liquor business had been fortunate enough to have had brainy

leadership, the question would probably have been settled in a different manner. But the liquor business did not have brains in its leadership, and has none now, which, together with an increase in "wet" gullibility, makes the finest kind of support for the "dry" program.

In the movement for a liquorless country you cannot minimize the immense aid given by the "wet" forces; they furnish the resistance which enables the movement to gather speed and power. The country could not go "dry" without them. And it is becoming "drier" all the time because of them.

Here is history before your eyes, with one of its most obvious lessons, namely, that movements are composed of opposing forces, and that the negative force is not to be despised. Without it there is no victory.

See how the saloon created this great tide of prohibition sentiment in the first place. For 100 years, America asked the public house to be a good community neighbor. It refused. America asked it to exclude little children from the bar. It refused. The refusal goaded public sentiment into passing ordinances. The saloon refused to obey. This refusal caused the level of public sentiment to rise high enough for enforcement. Reform after reform was suggested, each refused by the saloon. Each refusal added height to the head of public sentiment, and year after year it rose higher and higher, lifted by the assininity of saloon leadership. Higher and higher, year by year, until at length it leaped the dam and swept away the whole business. Prohibition was born in the stupidity of the liquor leaders.



Prohibition has reduced the liquor problem, so far as it relates to our men, to a point where we can easily handle it. Before prohibition there were in each group of 5,000 men about 100 who gave us trouble because of the liquor they drank. Now in each group of 5,000 there are not more than ten whose tendency to drink makes us trouble. There are not ten—ten is too high a figure.

Before prohibition we had to investigate absences from work to find out whether the men had been or were drunk or whether the men had good reasons for laying off. In a large proportion of such cases we found that drink was the cause. Now we do not have to investigate, because we have learned from observation that liquor is no longer the trouble. When a

man lays off a day or two we think nothing about it. As a result of prohibition our men are working more, working better, wasting less and saving more. Now when we raise a man's pay we know the increase will go to his wife or his savings account instead of to a saloonkeeper.

I am not in favor of the repeal or the modification of the Volstead Act. Let it stand as it is. I am in favor only of enforcing—and it can be enforced.



When one travels among the people—not the downtown class, not the club classes, not the local politicians, nor any class that judges the American people by a minority of degraded individuals—one gets quite a different view of the question. There are probably one hundred million people in the United States who go from day to day without the slightest consciousness of Prohibition as a debatable problem; certainly it is not the all-absorbing topic of their conversation. Liquor may be sensed in the theater, the legislature, the newspaper—it is not sensed at all in the millions of homes which comprise Our Country.

This false atmosphere of importance is created by men who live in a limited environment, who know "the crowd" but not "the people." Newspapers are especially illustrative of this fact. They are made downtown, but they are read out in the residential sections and in the suburbs; and the difference between downtown where "the crowd" is and the residence parts where "the people" are is so great that if editors should realize it, the liquor odor would be as carefully banished from the printed page as from the individual.



One has the privilege of withdrawing from the individual whose conversation, allusions, jokes, argument, and interest center around liquor. We don't have to listen to him. He lacks an audience except among those of his kind. But the newspapers and theater seem to feel that they have a special mission to make the people listen in public to the kind of thing they reject in private. The people will not submit to this imposition once they understand how the wires are pulled.

In common decency the liquor generation should be allowed to die in silence. Its agonies should not be one of the daily topics of American journalism. Prohibition was not intended to save those who had willfully and gladly sold themselves to alcohol; it was in-

tended to save the country and generations yet to come. There are a million boys growing up in the United States who have never seen a saloon and who will never know the handicap of liquor either in themselves or their relatives. And this excellent condition will go on spreading itself over the country when the "wet" press and the paid propagandist of booze are forgotten dust.



The United States is "dry" not only legally but by moral conviction. American sentiment is not downtown sentiment, nor club sentiment, nor blind pig sentiment, nor newspaper sentiment; it is home sentiment, and workshop sentiment, and store sentiment, and school sentiment, and church sentiment. You must find the people's sentiment where the people live, and they don't live downtown. Newspapers are made downtown and read in the residence sections; if they were made in the residence sections they would be "dry." The American home is "dry" and the American nation gets its tone from the home, not the "wet newspaper.



There will occur no concessions whatever as the result of a struggle between "wet" and "dry." When there shall have ceased to be such a thing as "wet" in the liquor sense in this country, then the things that remain to be done shall be done. There should be no mistake about that. The abolition of the commercialized liquor trade in this country is as final as the abolition of slavery. These are the two great reforms to which moral America committed itself from the beginning of its history.



The entire history of the legalized "traffic," as it was once called, is a story of attempts at and failures of control. Protected by a Government license; in partnership, as it were, with the Government of the United States; the ally of every harmful political movement in the country, the liquor traffic was entirely out of control. It could not be made to obey even the common regulations, such as forbidding children to frequent bars.

But under Prohibition everyone knows just where the liquor business stands—it is an outlaw. It has no more rights than burglary, incendiarism or any other crime. There was a time when the people of any neighborhood had to put up with it. No one has

to do that now. Any neighborhood, any city, can be cleansed of this blot.



The "wets" must be given large credit for making the country "dry." They furnished the excesses and stupidities which aroused public opinion to action. And they will yet complete what they have begun. All that is needed to enforce prohibition is for the "wets" to pursue their campaigns a little further; goad public opinion to the level of imperial demand and invincible action, and the thing will be done. The "wet" has never received the credit due his great part in making booze an outlaw. However unfortunate Prohibition may have been in its friends, it has always been most fortunate in its enemies. Opposition puts good causes across.



### SHARP AS TACKS

The Supreme Court has said:

"No legislature can bargain away the public health or public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants. No corporation or individual can acquire any rights, by contract or otherwise, which the government may not annul and take away, if the exercise of such rights becomes detrimental to the public health or the public morals. This power legitimately exercised can neither be limited by contract nor bartered away by legislation."



In the license cases, decided in 1847 (5 How. 504, 12 L. C. Ed. 314), Justice Grier said:


"Liquor, in its nature, is dangerous to the morals, good order, health, and safety of the people, and is not to be placed upon the same footing with the ordinary commodities of life, such as corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, potatoes, etc." (State vs. Aiken, 26 L. R. A. 345.)




Once in pre-Volstead days the Barkeepers' Association of Chicago, with its 7,000 saloons, offered to help the police suppress the 10,000 blind tigers and speak-easies of the city. On March 10, 1901, the Chicago Tribune printed the following news item:

"In the basements of decrepit frame buildings scattered throughout the Italian quarter of the West Side, detectives discovered casks containing 60,000 gallons of wine, pressed and fermented, in murky cellars of the quarter."

The first eleven amendments to the Constitution were ratified by the bare required majority. Four states refused to ratify the Twelfth Amendment, five would not ratify the Thirteenth, four would not approve the Fourteenth, and six refused approval to the Fifteenth. The Sixteenth was rejected by six states and twelve would not ratify the Seventeenth. The Nineteenth failed to secure the approval of ten states, but forty-six of the forty-eight states ratified the Eighteenth Amendment.




On the first day of 1808, the traffic in slaves officially ended, so far as the United States was concerned. But more than two hundred thousand slaves were smuggled in during the thirties, and in 1871 Congress took its last official action in the suppression of this trade.




The following news item appeared in a Galion, Ohio, paper in 1873:

"Nine hundred indictments were found against illicit distillers and other violators of the internal revenue laws at the recent session of the United States court at Charleston, W. Va."




Al Capone said:

"They call Al Capone a bootlegger. Yes, it's bootleg while it's on the trucks, but when your host at the club, in the locker room or on the gold coast hands it to you on a silver tray, it's hospitality."



Judge Broyles of Atlanta, Ga., who had experience with a law exempting beer from prohibition, is quoted as saying that "a light wine and beer law is practically unenforceable, as you cannot have a chemist with every barrel to see that your beer is light. Everything will be sold in a beer saloon. Besides, men do get drunk on beer, if they take enough of it."



"An arbitrary system must always be a corrupt one. There never was a man who thought he had no law but his own will who did not find that he had no end but his own profit."—Edmund Burke.

---

Published monthly by the Board of Temperance and Social Welfare of the Disciples of Christ. Subscription price, 50c. Mail should be addressed to 101 Bowling Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee.